

Remarks

Reconsideration and reversal of the rejections expressed in the Office Action of July 11, 2005 are respectfully contended in view of the following remarks and the application as amended. The present invention relates to a surface treatment process, comprising: providing a hydrophillic surface; polishing said surface with a slurry that comprises a suspension of abrasive particles in deionized water and TMAH, whereby said surface is rendered hydrophobic; and thereby causing all of said abrasive particles to be removed when said surface is rinsed in deionized water.

Claims 17, 19 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Andreas, U.S. Patent No. 6,358,325. In order to enhance the prosecution of the present application, the claims have been clarified as noted above.

Claims 18, 22-24 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Andreas as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Greiger et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,468,951. The Office Action states, inter alia, that it would have been obvious to use the TBAH or TMAH of Greiger with the process of Andreas for an effective cleaning composition

Andreas, U.S. Patent No. 6,358,325, relates to an integrated cleaner with scrubber for cleaning and scrubbing semiconductor substrates that includes a housing that contains both a cleaning module and a scrubbing module. The cleaning module is capable of performing a wet-cleaning process on a batch of the semiconductor substrates. Grieger, U.S. Patent No. 6,468,951, relates to a composition for cleaning a semiconductor device wherein the composition is comprised of a combination of solvent, hydrofluoric acid (HF) and tetraalkylammonium hydroxide (TAAH).

As noted at, e.g., column 9, lines 65-67 of Andreas, it is preferable that its brush scrubbing operation be performed in a high-pH solution. In contrast, column 7, lines 1-5 of Grieger et al. state that their aqueous HF composition changes rapidly from acidic, specifically from about 1-3, to alkaline, specifically from about 11-13. There is no teaching or suggestion in Andreas of the desirability of such alterations in pH. Therefore, Applicants respectfully contend that there is no teaching, suggestion or incentive supporting the combination of the Andreas and Grieger et al. references to produce the claimed invention, and prima facie obviousness is not established.

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully contended that the solicited claims define patentable subject matter. Reconsideration and reversal of the rejections expressed in the Office Action of July 11, 2005 are respectfully submitted. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if any questions arise during the course of reconsideration of this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/18/05

Richard A. Paikoff
Richard A. Paikoff
Reg. No. 34,892
Duane Morris LLP
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-4196
tel. 215-979-1853

PH1\1482440.1